

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1450 Alexascins, Virginia 22313-1450 www.emplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/596,060	05/26/2006	Sandrine Dulac	007035.00008	1280	
22908 BANNER & V	7590 02/25/200 VITCOFF, LTD.	9	EXAMINER		
TEN SOUTH	WACKER DRIVE		SAVAGE, JASON L		
SUITE 3000 CHICAGO, IL 60606			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,			1794		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			02/25/2009	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/596,060	DULAC ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
JASON L. SAVAGE	1794	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 12 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

The period for reply expires _____months from the mailing date of the final rejection. a)

b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailting date of the final rejection, even if timely filed. may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for
appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. X For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) X will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed:

Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-17 and 18-20.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). 13. Other: .

/JENNIFER MONEIL/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1794

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that claims 1-4, 6, 11-14 and 17 cannot be antiloptated by the prior art of Ueda (JP 2000-303132) because it requires that elements of Ca, Lt, and So be included in the core alloy in amounts that individually and/or combined would fall outside of the claimed range of "other elements" being present in less than 0.05% each and in total 0, 15%.

While a portion of Ueda does recite what Applicant describes, Ueda further teaches that a core alloy of 3003 aluminum was used and that errorion control elements were added individually and in combination to measure the erosion of the core [pag 100-20027]), 3003 aluminum has a nominal composition comprising Cu between 0.05-0.2%, \$10.6%, Fe 0.7%, Mn 1.0-1.5%, and Zn 0.10% which are all elements which may be employed in the claimed aluminum alloy and all fall within the claimed ranges for each element. Further, Ueda's Sample No. 9, 10 and 11 exemplify embodiments wherein the errosion control element is Y in amounts of 0.04, 0.12 and 0.58 respectively which would meet the claimed allow composition of the present invention. As such, Ueda is still considered to anticloidate the claim effect of anticloidate the claim end allow composition of the present invention. As such, Ueda is still considered to anticloidate the claim effect of anticloidate the claim ends allow composition of the present invention. As such, Ueda is still considered to anticloidate the claim ends and the composition of the present invention. As such, Ueda is still considered to anticloidate the claim ends and the composition of the present invention. As such, Ueda is still considered to anticloidate the claim ends and the composition of the present invention. As such, Ueda is still considered to anticloidate the claim ends and the composition of the present invention. As such, Ueda is still considered to anticloidate the claim ends and the composition of the present invention. As such, Ueda is still considered to anticloidate the calment.

Regarding claims 5, 8-10, 15-16 and 18-20, Applicant reiterates the same argument above that Ueda does not teach or suggest the claimed core alloy. However, as set forth above, Ueda exemplifies embodiments which meet the claimed compositions in claims 1,6 and 11. As such, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive.